

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/645,928	08/25/2000	Mark Benson	85ER-00155	4140	
759	90 03/24/2006		EXAM	INER	
John S Beulick	=		MORGAN, F	MORGAN, ROBERT W	
Armstrong Teasdale LLP Suite 2600 One Metropolitan Square			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
St Louis, MI 63102-2740			3626		

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/645,928	BENSON ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Robert W. Morgan	3626				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	i. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 De</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Corection to drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The Oath Oath Oath Oath Oath Oath Oath Oath	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		,				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/645,928

Art Unit: 3626

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Notice to Applicant

1. In the amendment filed 12/28/05 the following has occurred: Claims 1, 3, 10, 15 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-11, 13-16 and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,526,386 to Chapman et al. and "10-year term allows automatic renewal without underwriting" by National Underwriter: Life & Health/Financial Service (hereinafter "National Underwriter") in view of "ClientSoft Introduces eXoro, A Complete e-Service Solution for the Insurance Industry" by Business Wire, for substantially the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (dated 8/1/05). Further reasons appear below.
- (A) Claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-14 and 16 have not been amended, and are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (dated 8/1/05), and incorporated herein. Further reasons appear herein below.
- (B) Claims 1, 3, 10, 15 and 23 have been amended to now recite the step of "providing predetermined criteria for determining each insurance policy eligible for a renewal evaluation without requiring external underwriting and risk assessment process, the no-underwriting eligibility criteria is pre-determined by the insurance carrier/policy issuer, the no-underwriting

Art Unit: 3626

eligibility criteria including an insurance work classification assigned to a subscriber of the at least one identified renewal policy and a number of employees of the subscriber" and include "...the no-underwriting eligibility".

As per this limitation, Chapman teaches that a list of expiring policies is generated automatically by the system on a periodic basis, preferably daily by comparing cancellation date of each policy of insurance with the current date (see: column 5, lines 49-53). Software interface (126, Fig. 5) running on central computer (124, Fig. 5) compares the cancellation data of each policy of insurance with the current date (see: column 5, lines 50-53). In addition, Chapman et al. teaches that the insurance carrier may optionally conduct verification either prior to the initial identification of each expiring policy (e.g. by classifying each expiring policy prior to expiration) or subsequent to ordering the renewal (see: column 6, lines 35-41). The Examiner considers the classification to be completed by the eligibility generator that determines which policies are eligible for renewal by the insurance carrier. Furthermore, comparing the "date" to generate a list of expiring policies is considered pre-determined criteria for determining each insurance policy eligible for a renewal.

Chapman fails to teach renewal evaluation without requiring external underwriting and risk assessment processes.

National Underwriter teaches a new policy that allows automatic renewal, without new underwriting at the end of the policy (see: abstract). The Examiner considers the newly implemented policy or procedure of automatically renewing policies without underwriting to meet the claimed limitation.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include renewal without underwriting and risk assessment as taught by National Underwriter within the system for generating automobile insurance certificates from a remote computer terminal as taught by Chapman with the motivation of enhancing the customer's overall experience regarding renewal policies thereby increasing the loyalty to the customer to the insurance agencies.

The other changes merely cancel words, but otherwise does not affect the scope and breath of the claim as originally presented and/or in the manner in which the Examiner when applying prior art with the previous Office Action interpreted the claims. As such, the recited claims features of claims 1, 3, 10, 15 and 23 are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action, and incorporated herein.

- 4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,526,386 to Chapman et al. and "10-year term allows automatic renewal without underwriting" by National Underwriter: Life & Health/Financial Service (hereinafter "National Underwriter") and "ClientSoft Introduces eXoro, A Complete e-Service Solution for the Insurance Industry" by Business Wire applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Official Notice, for same reasons given in the previous Office Action (dated 8/1/06).
- 5. Claims 17-22 and 24-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,526,386 to Chapman et al. and "10-year term allows automatic renewal without underwriting" by National Underwriter: Life & Health/Financial Service (hereinafter "National Underwriter") and "ClientSoft Introduces eXoro, A Complete e-Service Solution for the Insurance Industry" by Business Wire as applied to claims 1, 3 and 23 above, and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,080 to Kern, for same reasons given in the previous Office Action (dated 8/1/06).

Response to Arguments

- 13. Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response 12/28/05.
- (A) In response to the Applicant's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has applied new citations and passages from the Chapman and Business Wire references to the amended features of amended claims 1, 3, 10, 15 and 23 at the present time. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Chapman, National Underwriter, Business Wire, Official Notice and Kern to the amended claims are addressed in the above Office Action.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 09/645,928

Art Unit: 3626

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6773.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner Art Unit 3626

Page 6